REMARKS

I. Introduction

With the cancellation herein without prejudice of claims 23 and 41 and the addition of new claims 42 to 45, claims 13, 14, 17 to 19, 22, 27, 29 to 40 and 42 to 45 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Objections to the Drawings Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a)

As regards the objection to the drawings, while Applicant does not necessarily agree with the merits of this objection or any of the contentions set forth in paragraph 2 of the Final Office Action, the claims have been amended herein without prejudice to even more fully set forth the subject matter claimed. As a consequence, it is respectfully submitted that all of the features recited in the pending claims are fully illustrated in the several Figures. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the present objection is moot, and withdrawal of this present objection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 13 to 19, 22 to 24, 27 and 29 to 41 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 13 to 19, 22 to 24, 27 and 29 to 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. While Applicant does not necessarily agree with the merits of this rejection or any of the contentions set forth in paragraph 4 of the Final Office Action, the claims have been amended herein without prejudice to even more fully set forth the subject matter claimed. As a consequence, it is respectfully submitted that the claims as presented fully conform to the definiteness requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 13, 39 and 41 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 13, 39 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,771,471 ("Alberth, Jr. et al."). Applicant respectfully submits that Alberth, Jr. et al. does not anticipate the present claims as amended herein for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, claim 41 has been canceled herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the present rejection with respect to claim 41.

Claim 13 has been amended herein without prejudice to recite that "the battery charger includes a circuit adapted to set at least one electrical charge parameter of a charge upon connection of the unit to the battery charger via the connection element, the at least one electrical charge parameter being set by the circuit in accordance with a corresponding reference signal having a value dependent on a resistance of a corresponding one of the at least one resistor of the arrangement." Support for the foregoing amendment may be found, for example, on page 5, line 33 to page 6, line 8 of the Specification.

Alberth, Jr. et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, at least these features. In this regard, Alberth, Jr. et al. may mention that converter circuitry 168 may include a series-connected resistor 172 and diode 176. According to Alberth, Jr. et al., the converter circuitry 168 converts operative power of constant voltage into operative power of a constant current. However, Alberth, Jr. et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, that a battery charger includes a circuit adapted to set an electrical charge parameter in accordance with a ***reference signal having a value dependent on a resistance of a resistor***. It is furthermore respectfully submitted that Alberth, Jr. et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, that a set includes an arrangement outside of a battery charger including at least one resistor, in which the battery charger includes a circuit that is adapted to set at least one electrical charge parameter of a charge upon connection of a unit to the battery charger via a connection element. The Final Office Action contends that radio transceiver 300 constitutes a battery charger and that variable level power source 606 constitutes an arrangement outside of a battery charger. However, there is nothing to indicate that the variable level power source 606 includes at least one resistor or that the radio transceiver 300 includes a circuit that is adapted to set at least one electrical charge parameter of a charge in accordance with a corresponding reference signal having a value dependent on a resistance of a resistor of the variable level power source 606. Simply put, Alberth, Jr. et al. simply do not identically disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in amended claim 13.

Claim 39 has been amended herein without prejudice in a manner similar to claim 13. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Alberth, Jr. et al. do not identically disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in amended claim 39 for at least the reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Alberth, Jr. et al. do not anticipate claims 13 and 39. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 13 to 19, 22 to 24, 27 and 29 to 41 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 13 to 19, 22 to 24, 27 and 29 to 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,535,274 ("Braitberg et al."). Applicant respectfully submits that Braitberg et al. does not anticipate the present claims as amended herein for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, claims 23 and 41 have been canceled herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the present rejection with respect to claims 23 and 41.

As more fully set forth above, claim 13 has been amended herein without prejudice to recite that "the battery charger includes a circuit adapted to set at least one electrical charge parameter of a charge upon connection of the unit to the battery charger via the connection element, the at least one electrical charge parameter being set by the circuit in accordance with a corresponding reference signal having a value dependent on a resistance of a corresponding one of the at least one resistor of the arrangement." Claims 37 and 39 have been amended herein in an analogous manner.

Braitberg et al. fails to describe a reference signal that has a value dependent on a resistance of a resistor of an arrangement outside of a battery charger or a circuit that is adapted to set an electrical charge parameter in accordance with such a reference signal. Rather, Braitberg et al. describe a ROM chip 330 that downloads information, including appropriate electrical parameters, to a microprocessor in battery charger 650. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Braitberg et al. do not identically disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in amended claims 13, 37 and 39.

Claim 22 has been amended herein without prejudice to recite that a connection element that is configured to connect a battery charger to a battery unit includes at least one resistor. Claim 22 has been further amended herein without prejudice to recite that the connection element includes first connection terminals and second connection terminals, the first connection terminals adapted to deliver a charge from the battery charger to the battery unit, the second connection terminals adapted to connect the at least one resistor to a circuit of the battery charger and to deliver reference signals between the connection element and the circuit, the circuit adapted to set in the battery charger parameters of the charge of the battery unit delivered from the battery charger to the battery unit by the first connection

terminals, the connection element removable from the battery charger and from the unit. Support for the amendments to claim 22 may be found, for example, in Figure 2. Braitberg et al. fail to identically disclose, or even suggest, at least one resistor, first connection terminals and second connection terminals as recited in claim 22. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Braitberg et al. do not anticipate claim 22.

As for claims 17, 18, 29 and 40, which depend from claim 13 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 13, it is respectfully submitted that Braitberg et al. do not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 13.

As for claim 36, which depends from claim 22 and therefore includes all of the features recited in claim 22, it is respectfully submitted that Braitberg et al. do not anticipate dependent claim 36 for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 22.

As for claims 32 and 38, which ultimately depend from claim 37 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 37, it is respectfully submitted that Braitberg et al. do not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 37.

As for claims 14, 19, 27, 30, 31 and 33 to 35, which depend from claim 39 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 39, it is respectfully submitted that Braitberg et al. do not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 39.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. New Claims 42 to 45

New claims 42 to 45 have been added herein. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 42 to 45 add no new matter and are fully supported by the present application, including the Specification.

Since claim 42 depends from claim 13, it is respectfully submitted that claim 42 is patentable over the references relied upon for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 13.

Since claim 43 depends from claim 22, it is respectfully submitted that claim 43 is patentable over the references relied upon for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 22.

Since claim 44 depends from claim 37, it is respectfully submitted that claim 44 is patentable over the references relied upon for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 37.

Since claim 45 depends from claim 39, it is respectfully submitted that claim 45 is patentable over the references relied upon for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 39.

VII. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 30, 2005 By: _____

Clifford A. Ulrich
Reg. No. 42,194

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646